

NYCS - UNOG Document transmission

6 November 1986

DEST: WAS.UNIC
ORIG: NY.DPI/PUB

TO: KAMINSKY -- UNIC DIRECTOR
FROM: WARNER -- NY/DPI/PUB

DEST: GVA.INFO
TO: T. GASTAUT -- UNOG/INFO SERVICE, GENEVA

DEST: VIE.UNOV
TO: RUDOLPH -- UNOV/INFO SERVICE, VIENNA

DEST: NY.PRESS
TO: SCHMITT -- NY/DPI/PRESS

SUBJECT: WEEKLY TRANSMISSION

Following document transmitted today,
6 November 1986: 0025W (Weekly
Digest).

HIGHLIGHTS OF UN EVENTS 30 OCTOBER-5 NOVEMBER

IN THIS ISSUE:

*

Concern on UNIFIL*
Afghanistan Vote*
Rights Anniversary*
Africa Relief*
Assembly Activities*
SG Statements*
El Salvador Aid*
European Motorway*
Postal Improvement*
NGO Notes*
UN Television

ASSEMBLY CALLS FOR WITHDRAWAL OF FOREIGN TROOPS FROM AFGHANISTAN;
URGES PARTIES TO WORK FOR URGENT ACHIEVEMENT OF POLITICAL SOLUTION

The General Assembly this morning called for the withdrawal of foreign troops from Afghanistan and urged the parties concerned to work for the urgent achievement of a political solution.

Adopting a 46-Power resolution (document A/41/L.12), by a recorded vote of 122 in favour to 20 against, with 11 abstentions, the Assembly reaffirmed the right of the Afghan people to determine their own form of government and to choose their economic, political and social system free from outside intervention, subversion, coercion or constraint. Further, the Assembly called for the creation of the necessary conditions to enable the Afghan refugees to return voluntarily to their homes in safety and honour. (See Annex for details of vote on resolution.)

Also by the resolution, the Assembly renewed its appeal to all States and national and international organizations to continue to extend humanitarian relief assistance to alleviate the hardship of the Afghan refugees, in co-ordination with the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR). It reiterated that the preservation of the sovereignty, territorial integrity, political independence and non-aligned character of Afghanistan was essential for a peaceful solution of the problem.

The Assembly expressed support for the constructive steps taken by the Secretary-General, especially the diplomatic process initiated by him, in the search for a solution to the problem. It requested him to continue those efforts with a view to promoting a political solution.

The Assembly heard statements in the debate by the representatives of the Netherlands, Italy, India, Canada, the Federal Republic of Germany, Thailand, Sweden, Bangladesh, the Comoros, Nigeria and Singapore.

Statements in explanation of vote were made by the representatives of Burkina Faso, Iran, Sao Tome and Principe, Mexico, Bolivia and Libya.

When it meets again at 3 p.m. today, the Assembly will consider the report of the Special Committee on the Law of the Sea and take action on a draft resolution that would have it call on States to consider ratifying or acceding to the Convention and to desist from actions that "undermine the Convention or defeat its object and purpose". Also this afternoon, the Assembly will begin the first of four scheduled plenary meetings on the policies of apartheid of the Government of South Africa.

ASSEMBLY PLenary -- TAKE 1

The General Assembly meets this morning to conclude its debate on the situation relating to Afghanistan and its implications for peace and security, and to take action on a draft resolution calling for the withdrawal of foreign troops from Afghanistan and a political settlement of the conflict there (for background information, see Press Release GA/7401 of 4 November).

The meeting was called to order by the Assembly President, HUMAYUN RASHEED CHOUDHURY (Bangladesh), at 10:18 a.m.

ADRIAAN JACOBOWITS DE SZEGED (Netherlands) said the continued Soviet occupation of Afghanistan violated international peace and security and was further endangering stability in that region. The overwhelming Soviet military might had brought about an exodus of refugees to neighbouring countries of unprecedented magnitude and an authentic and courageous popular resistance.

He concurred with the view of the representative of the United Kingdom that the large-scale military intervention of the Soviet Union was living proof of the determination of that country to pursue its own ends by the massive and sustained use of military power.

The Netherlands could not accept the Soviet claim that its troops had entered Afghanistan at the expressed invitation of the legitimate Government at Kabul. That was irreconcilable with the first acts at Kabul after the intervention, that is, the murder of the then President and the installation of a new and compliant regime.

The implementation of the General Assembly's resolutions calling for the withdrawal of all foreign troops from Afghanistan and for a political settlement was long overdue.

The Netherlands condemned the incursions upon Pakistan's air space and attacks and bombings upon its territory, resulting in the loss of many lives. The neighbouring States of Pakistan and Iran carried the burden of having to shelter millions of Afghans seeking refuge from the continuous warfare. He paid tribute to the efforts of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) and other international agencies to alleviate that situation. Those organizations had been aided in their work by the nations of refuge and many foreign countries, including the Netherlands.

Afghanistan's popular resistance, he continued, was being repressed with a callous disregard for the most elementary principles of human rights. The Soviet Union, as the occupying force, carried a heavy share of the responsibility for the appalling human rights situation in the country.

He noted that tangible progress had been made in the endeavours by the Secretary-General and his Special Representative, Diego Cordovez, to bring about a negotiated settlement. The Soviet Union should break the present impasse by clearly stating its intention to withdraw troops from Afghanistan in the shortest possible time. The withdrawal of six regiments, as announced by General Secretary Gorbachev, was not even a first step, considering that over 110,000 Soviet troops remained in Afghanistan. The way the withdrawal of the six regiments was reported to be implemented only confirmed that

(END OF TAKE 1)

ASSEMBLY PLENARY -- TAKE 2

MAURIZIO BUCCI (*Italy*) was concerned at the implications of the Afghan crisis for international as well as regional security and stability. He was concerned by the immense human sufferings which had resulted from the war waged against the Afghan people, and by the burden the war was imposing on Pakistan, a friendly country whose sovereignty and territorial integrity was being systematically violated. Pakistan's development, he continued, was being jeopardized by the appalling economic consequences of the refugee problem.

The prolongation of the crisis had had a negative effect on the authority and the credibility of the United Nations, he said. The Soviet invasion of Afghanistan was a major violation of the Charter and of established norms of international law. When Assembly resolutions were "so totally disregarded", the Organization as a whole was weakened and all nations stood to lose, including those who bore the responsibility for the situation.

Italy firmly supported the efforts of the Secretary-General and his Special Representative to find a just and lasting solution to the question of Afghanistan. He regretted the slow pace of the proximity talks in Geneva. There was an urgent need for major policy changes on the part of those who were responsible for the current situation, for there could be no military solution, only a political settlement.

Meanwhile, he stated, the General Assembly had the duty to maintain the political pressure which was the complement of the mission of good offices of the Secretary-General.

(END OF TAKE 2)

ASSEMBLY PLENARY -- TAKE 3

VAYALAR RAVI (India) said the people of Afghanistan had inherited an ancient civilization which had made courage and self-respect the hallmarks of Afghan nationalism. They must pursue the path of progress suited to their own genius. As the Indian Prime Minister had told the United States Congress in June 1985, India was opposed to both foreign presence and pressure. It was for a political settlement in Afghanistan that ensured Afghanistan's sovereignty, integrity, independence and non-aligned status and enabled the refugees to return in safety and honour.

India's concern over Afghanistan and the region as a whole was inextricably linked with its own security interests, he stated. India was particularly concerned at the introduction of sophisticated weaponry into the region. The situation there could only be resolved through an overall political settlement.

India was pleased that the Secretary-General had pursued with determination his efforts to promote the search for a political solution. It supported his endeavours and those of his Personal Representative. It was his understanding that their efforts had the support of the international community. In that context, he felt that the approach contained in the draft resolution was "less than fully constructive and supportive". The text ignored the efforts and progress made and he, therefore, could not support it.

STEPHEN LEWIS (Canada) said that to call what had happened in Afghanistan, as had the Soviet Foreign Minister in the general debate, a "national democratic revolution" was to render words meaningless. "It is a linguistic mask designed to hide the brute face of oppression."

Yesterday, the Soviet Union had characterized the events of the last seven years as an "armed intervention" against the sovereign State of Afghanistan. The mere use of that phrase set the mind reeling, he stated. Standing history on its head insulted every country in the chamber. It was the Soviet military juggernaut that had rolled into Kabul in December 1979 to install a puppet fiefdom and subdue an entire people. He was talking about a premeditated act of military subjugation. The Charter, "when last read by Canada, had no chapter on territorial amalgamation by force of arms". As far as Canada was concerned, the "fruits" of the Afghan revolution meant 1 million Afghans dead in a killing-field. And every year the situation deteriorated and the chronicle grew more grim.

He said it was almost inconceivable that in 1986, any invading army, no matter what the provocation, would use concealed devices against innocent children. But it was being done with "a sickness equivalent to depravity".

ASSEMBLY PLENARY -- TAKE 4

Mr. LEWIS (Canada) went on to say that the report of the United Nations Special Rapporteur on Human Rights violations in Afghanistan was uniformly appalling when it referred to human rights violations that raised the spectre of genocide, and concrete evidence of the torture of women; and also referred to education provided in those areas of Afghanistan within the control of Soviet and Government forces that rejected traditional religious, cultural and moral values.

The day was fast approaching when the numbers of refugees outside Afghanistan and those uprooted and dispossessed inside the country would total more than 50 per cent of the entire population at any time of the invasion. He went on to say violation of Pakistan's borders had escalated dramatically. Six Soviet regiments had departed from Afghanistan. But what mattered was that over 110,000 men remained behind for the purpose of pacification. The world needed more than tokens as evidence of good faith. During the past year, with a magnificent tenacity which he honoured and supported, the United Nations team had focused discussion on the precise question of troop withdrawal. And what happened? The Soviet Union would not give a reasonable time-frame for the withdrawal. "It took them only 72 hours to get in. It need take no more than a week or two to get out", he said, but if political will was absent, then the military might remained.

The Soviet Union would do itself an enormous favour and do the international community an incalculable boon were it to accept the reasonable contents of the draft resolution, the precepts of the Charter, the clamour of nation-States, the cries of the people of Afghanistan, "and get out of that country", he said. The rest of the Member States could at least keep the issue alive and keep the pressure on. There were few issues which united virtually all Member States. South Africa was one and Afghanistan should be another. Even those in nominal ideological alliance with the Soviet Union should break ranks on Afghanistan.

(END OF TAKE 4)

ASSEMBLY PLenary -- TAKE 5

HANS WERNER LAUTENSCHLAGER (Federal Republic of Germany) said his delegation fully shared the position of the 12 member States of the European Community on Afghanistan as had been outlined by the Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom on 4 November.

Seven years of Afghan resistance to a regime installed by force made it abundantly clear that the Afghan people were not willing to submit to a regime which they had not freely chosen, he said. Nevertheless, in flagrant violation of international law and of its obligations under the Charter, the Soviet Union continued stationing its troops in Afghanistan in order to impose its will on an Islamic country, which desired to be an independent, non-aligned State.

His Government supported the Islamic and non-aligned countries in their efforts for a speedy solution of the Afghan problem which respected the wishes of the Afghan people and put an end to their suffering, he said. The Federal Government shared the profound distress and alarm of the overwhelming majority of Member States at the widespread massive violations of human rights and fundamental freedoms resulting from military repression and the presence of foreign forces in Afghanistan. His Government was providing exclusively humanitarian relief assistance to the Afghan refugees and would continue to do so.

The Federal Government welcomed and supported the mediation efforts of the Personal Representative of the Secretary-General, which seemed to be the only promising way to find an acceptable solution. Political will to reach a solution was of the essence, and his Government called upon the Soviet Union to act accordingly. The publicly announced Soviet withdrawal of six regiments from Afghanistan would constitute only a 5 per cent reduction of its probably more than 110,000 troops remaining. He called upon the Soviet Union to withdraw all its troops from Afghanistan and reiterated the hope that all Afghans might soon exercise their right of self-determination in full freedom.

BIRABHONGSE KASEMSRI (Thailand) said that the military invasion and occupation of Afghanistan by Soviet forces, in blatant violation of the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of a Member State of the United Nations, posed a serious threat to international peace and security. The ferocious onslaught by superior force had killed and maimed one tenth of the population, and had left a trail of desolation and devastation. While it had not cowed the brave resistance fighters, it had caused death and suffering, particularly among the civilians, including women and children.

Pakistan as the front-line State had been compelled to shoulder a heavy burden, he said. According to the Foreign Minister of Pakistan, in 1986 there had been over 600 air violations and over 100 ground violations against Pakistan as compared to 197 air violations and 20 ground violations during 1985. That had been accompanied by a campaign of sabotage and terrorism against innocent Afghan refugees and Pakistani citizens.

(more)

Thailand was insistent on its demand for the withdrawal of the foreign troops from Afghanistan, and was desirous of seeing a comprehensive political settlement of the problem. Such a settlement, he said, should be based on the following elements: the immediate withdrawal of foreign troops, exercise of self-determination, respect for the sovereignty, independence, territorial integrity and non-aligned status of Afghanistan, and safe and honourable return of the Afghan refugees.

His country hoped that all parties concerned would redouble their efforts to expedite solutions for the most crucial questions of time-frame and modality for the withdrawal of the foreign troops. Failure or delay in reaching an agreement on those questions would not only prolong the agony of the Afghan people, but also increase the danger to peace and stability in the region and beyond. In co-sponsoring the draft resolution (document A/41/L.12), his delegation was convinced, he said, that the draft resolution provided a reasonable framework for a just and lasting political settlement of the Afghanistan problem.

(END OF TAKE 5)

ASSEMBLY PLENARY — TAKE 6

ANDERS FERM (Sweden) said the withdrawal of a few thousand Soviet troops from Afghanistan could only be regarded as a token gesture. The Soviet invaders were still firmly entrenched in Afghanistan and the international community was therefore compelled to call for their immediate withdrawal once again.

His delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution before the Assembly because it contained the elements necessary for a peaceful and fair end to the conflict: the withdrawal of all foreign forces; guarantees on Afghan self-determination, sovereignty and territorial integrity; and the repatriation of Afghan refugees.

History had placed Afghanistan next to a powerful neighbour that flaunted its military superiority without regard to international law or humanitarian considerations.

The world had watched in horror, he went on, as Soviet troops had violated humanitarian principles embodied in international conventions to which the Soviet Union was a signatory. The Special Rapporteur of the Commission on Human Rights had described gross violations of human rights in Afghanistan, including torture, summary executions and other forms of victimization of the civilian population. His Government condemns those practices. In addition, Pakistan and Iran had responded with great generosity to a refugee problem of gigantic proportions. Pakistan had also had its territorial integrity repeatedly and seriously violated as a result of the conflict. Sweden had provided substantial support for the humanitarian activities carried out by the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) and non-governmental organizations to assist the refugees and the neighbouring countries. It was vital that the international assistance to the victims of the conflict be continued.

(END OF TAKE 6)

ASSEMBLY PLENARY -- TAKE 7

B.A. SIDDIKY (Bangladesh) said that when the Assembly had heard of the commitment of Member States to the Charter at last year's commemorative session, how hollow those words must have sounded in the streets of Kandahar and in the bazaars of Kabul. The carefree ways of the freedom-loving Afghans had been enshackled in bondage and suppression.

He said the Afghan tragedy was marked by the painful presence of a vast foreign military machinery, a Government in Kabul that did not command popular support, and the harrowing experience of five million refugees in neighbouring Islamic nations.

Bangladesh's position on the question had always been firm and principled, he continued. For that reason it would lend its full support to the draft resolution before the Assembly, which objectively pointed the way to the most acceptable conclusion to the tragic issue. He commended the endeavours by the Secretary-General and his Personal Representative for facilitating the process of dialogue among the parties directly concerned.

While the recent withdrawals of the foreign troops were heartening, they had been minimal in proportion to their total presence. Bangladesh emphasized the need for complete withdrawal within an agreed time-frame and hoped that all Afghans would soon be able to determine their own destiny like free peoples everywhere.

"Freedom always comes to those who ardently strive for her, as she shall, to the Afghans", he said in conclusion.

(END OF TAKE 7)

ASSEMBLY PLINARY -- TAKE 8

AMINI ALI MOUMIN (Comoros) said that for seven years the people of Afghanistan had continued their heroic struggle against the intensive, merciless and fearsome firing power of the invader, he went on to say. For seven years, that unfortunate people had been inflicted with untold suffering and millions had fled their beloved country to seek refuge in the neighbouring countries. In Pakistan alone, there were over 3 million Afghan refugees. By intervening militarily in Afghanistan, he said, the Soviet Union had not only violated the Charter, but its responsibility as a super-Power to maintain international peace and security. However, during the past year some positive signs had surfaced: the Soviet offer to seek dialogue with Afghans across the frontiers, and the announced withdrawal of six anti-aircraft regiments from Afghanistan. Those were gestures not to be ignored or spurned, but assessed for what they were worth.

The Comoros welcomed the token withdrawal as the first step towards the total withdrawal of Soviet forces from Afghanistan, which was a necessary condition for any meaningful settlement. An acceptable time-frame for total withdrawal was now required, he stated.

He called upon the Soviet Union to seize the momentum of the Geneva talks and take seriously the observation of the Secretary-General that all attention must be focused now on the question of withdrawal. The Soviet Union must be made to understand in clear language that its intervention and "unholy actions" in Afghanistan were morally and politically undefendable and would continue to be universally censured until it withdrew its occupying forces. Regrettably, the diplomatic process initiated by the Secretary-General had been stalled due to Kabul's insistence on having direct negotiation with Pakistan before it could discuss the time-frame for withdrawal.

OLU ADENIJI (Nigeria) said that the best way of achieving a political settlement was for all concerned to adhere strictly to the purposes and principles of the Charter, not only by showing their resolve for the peaceful settlement of disputes, but also respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of States. Unfortunately, a wide gap still remained to be bridged in the search for a political solution to the problem in Afghanistan.

Nigeria had consistently demonstrated her opposition to external interference in the internal affairs of any country, he said, and had subscribed to the inalienable rights of all peoples to determine their own destiny free from outside interference, coercion or intimidation. The proud people of Afghanistan who had enjoyed those attributes prior to the present crisis must again be enabled to resume their independence of action.

His country did not subscribe to a doctrine that sought to justify armed intervention and violation of the integrity of any State in the name of defending the gains of any revolution, he said. Similarly, it did not support any intervention and violation of the sovereignty of any State in the name of the preservation of a status quo. "Just as we do not accept the concept of spheres of influence, so we do not believe that any State is good enough to determine the leadership of another State on political, ideological or any other grounds." That was why his country called for the total and speedy withdrawal of all foreign forces from Afghanistan.

Nigeria supported the efforts of the United Nations to end the crisis in Afghanistan, he said, as the Organization provided the most appropriate

ASSEMBLY PLENARY -- TAKE 9

KISHORE MAHBUBANI (Singapore) said that the report of the Special Rapporteur on Afghanistan had observed that the war in that country showed no signs of diminishing. Indeed, the occupying Soviet army, perhaps in desperation, had resorted to more brutal measures. Major international covenants and conventions had been violated in Afghanistan. The Special Rapporteur had stated in his report that since the invasion and occupation of Afghanistan in December 1979, one third of the population had fled the country. In the face of such overwhelming evidence, how could the description of the invasion as a liberation be accepted? he asked.

He was encouraged that some units of the Soviet armed forces would be returning home before the end of 1986, he said. Reports that the withdrawal of those troops was only part of a covert process of rotation were troubling, however. What was needed in Afghanistan was international verification of the situation. So far, even the Special Rapporteur had been refused entry to study the situation in Afghanistan.

The Soviet Union had stated that its troops would be withdrawn only at the request of the Government of Afghanistan. But since the Kabul regime was completely under the control of the Soviet Union, how could it request the withdrawal of Soviet troops? Knowing the fate that befell President Hafizullah Amin when he angered the Soviet Government, would any regime in Kabul have the temerity to ask for such a withdrawal? he asked.

The Soviet Union had paid a heavy price for its involvement in Afghanistan, he said. Its society had been demoralized by the war as more and more Soviet casualties were sent home from Afghanistan. After seven years, the Soviet Union should be convinced that a military victory in Afghanistan was not possible. Even the scorched-earth policy of recent years had failed to dampen the fighting spirit of the Afghan resistance forces, he stated.

The resolution before the Assembly had been carefully crafted to provide the Soviet Union a diplomatic way out of Afghanistan, he said. It was based on the principles enshrined in the Charter and provided a renewed mandate for the Secretary-General and his Representative to continue their constructive efforts to find a solution to the Afghan problem. He hoped that more nations would vote for the resolution this year, thereby making it more likely that Afghanistan would regain its freedom and independence.

ASSEMBLY PLENARY -- TAKE 10

The Assembly then turned to act on the draft resolution introduced yesterday by the Foreign Minister of Pakistan (document A/41/L.12), which would have it call for the immediate withdrawal of foreign troops from Afghanistan.

Explaining his vote before the vote, ANTONIN OUEDRAOGO (Burkina Faso) said the authorities in Kabul had done their utmost to restore peace and stability to Afghanistan. The present draft did not adequately address the constructive progress made towards an accommodation in Afghanistan and the Soviet Union's goodwill gesture in withdrawing several of its regiments from that country. His delegation would, therefore, vote against the proposal.

The Assembly President, Mr. CHOUDHURY (Bangladesh), then called on the representative of Iran to speak in explanation of vote.

Because of difficulties due to several non-functioning microphones, the PRESIDENT invited the representative of Iran to speak from the rostrum.

SAID RAJAIE-KHORASSANI (Iran) said his delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution before the Assembly, but he wished to clarify some points regarding the reality of the invasion of Afghanistan. The invasion of Afghanistan by Soviet forces was an invasion of an Islamic territory and people and, as such, an attack on Islam and the entire Muslim world. Those who claimed to respect Islam and wished to maintain friendly relations with the Muslim family of nations should remember that any military intervention in any part of the Muslim world was tantamount to an attack on the entire world of Islam and on Islam itself. The draft resolution failed to take due notice of that aspect of the invasion of Afghanistan.

His Government could not be quite satisfied with a resolution that shied away from naming the aggressor or spelling out specifically the fact that the sovereignty and independence of the Afghan people had been violated.

Around 2 million Afghans had taken refuge in Iran, he said. Although Iran was duty-bound to host its Afghan brothers and sisters, the heavy load that was imposed on its war-ravaged economy must not remain unattended by the international body. What was usually simplified as the "internal affairs of Afghanistan" was not so "internal"; the overflow of that so-called internal affair had affected other nations.

He said those who could not rule without the military support of foreign forces could have no claim to legitimacy. It was totally unjustifiable that Afghanistan had become the battleground for foreign forces against the Afghan people while those people remained refugees in other countries. The only possible political solution to the problem of Afghanistan was the realization of the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of the Soviet military forces of occupation from Afghanistan, which was, in fact, in the interests of the Soviet Union as well; the voluntary and honourable return of Afghan refugees

(more)

to their homeland; and recognition of their inalienable right to Government and self-determination. All talks in which the people of Afghanistan, the main party to the negotiations, were not present, were of no avail.

He said the representative of the present Afghan regime often spoke of direct negotiations without further delay and the Afghan mujahidin, the real party to the negotiations, urged the same. If goodwill prevailed, constructive negotiations could start immediately. The present talks in Geneva were devoid of validity because of the absence of the Afghan people. He expressed reservations with regard to certain preambular and operative elements of the draft.

He said Iran advocated an independent and non-aligned regime for Afghanistan that was representative of the Muslim Afghan people and absolutely independent of all foreign coercions and interventions. "Thus, the other supercilious Power too should have no vision of imposing a pro-imperialist regime on Afghanistan or intervening in the affairs of Afghan people in any manner." His Government strongly opposed such interventions and interferences without any reservation, and condemned such interventions strongly.

The PRESIDENT asked the sound technicians to ensure that "the voice of the Islamic Republic of Iran is not muted".

(END OF TAKE 10)

ASSEMBLY PLENARY -- TAKE 11

JOAQUIM RAFAEL BRANCO (Sao Tome and Principe) said his delegation had for many years abstained in the General Assembly's votes on the situation in Afghanistan. The situation was complex and fraught with East-West tensions. There were several sources of aggravation in connection with the situation in Afghanistan. His country consistently supported the sovereignty and self-determination of States and was pleased by the progress made in the Secretary-General's mediation process. Since the draft resolution before the Assembly contained several constructive elements, Sao Tome and Principe would vote in favour of the draft resolution this year.

MOHAMMAD FARID ZARIF (Afghanistan) said his country had categorically rejected the inclusion of the item in the Assembly's agenda and in any other international forum. The draft resolution constituted a gross violation of the Charter. Its sponsors had arrogated to themselves the right to advise the Afghan people on the socio-economic and political path they had to take. The Afghan people had already chosen their path.

There had been a deliberate fabrication of the number of refugees within Pakistan. There was an intention to pocket hundreds of millions of dollars in the name of refugee assistance, he continued. There had been many reported instances of double and triple registration of refugees. A declaration of general amnesty had already been announced, as far as bona fide refugees were concerned. Despite attempts to stop information of the amnesty reaching refugees in Pakistan, many thousands had already returned to Afghanistan.

He said the limited Soviet military contingent in his country was present at the invitation of the legitimate Government and it had been invited to repel armed intervention from outside. Meanwhile, there had been an escalation of the undeclared war against Afghanistan. Increasingly sophisticated arms were being channeled to counter-revolutionary bandits and training camps were in operation in Pakistan, China and the United States. The enemies of the Afghan revolution had tried to prolong bloodshed and delay a true political settlement. Common sense dictated the need for confidence and trust between negotiating parties and such a trust could not be engendered in the slanderous and acrimonious debate that the Assembly had witnessed. The draft resolution would not forward the peace process.

He therefore strongly rejected the draft. Even if adopted, the resolution would be devoid of validity and would not be binding on his Government, he said. The only way to a negotiated settlement was through direct bilateral negotiations as proposed by his Government. Pakistan and its patrons must be made to abandon once and for all their past policies and practices.

ASSEMBLY PLENARY -- TAKE 12

Before the Assembly voted, the Assembly President, Mr. CHOUDHURY (Bangladesh), announced that a report of the Fifth Committee (Administrative and Budgetary) on the programme budget implications of the draft resolution was contained in document A/41/792.

The Assembly then adopted the resolution by a recorded vote of 122 in favour to 20 against, with 11 abstentions. (See Annex for voting details.)

MARIO MOYA PALENCIA (Mexico), speaking in explanation of vote after the vote, said that the principle of prohibiting recourse to the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of States was a fundamental norm of the Charter and of customary international law. It could not be subject to unilateral interpretation. That norm had always been firmly defended by his country which had frequently condemned illegal occupation of territory, acts of aggression, the intent to destabilize legitimately constituted Governments, and support for groups that sought to destroy those Governments.

He hoped the process of withdrawal of foreign troop from Afghanistan would be speeded up until it was completed. His delegation had supported the draft resolution and hoped for a peaceful solution to the situation.

MARY CARRASCO (Bolivia) wished to express her delegation's support for the Secretary-General's tireless efforts in search of a solution to the problems of Afghanistan. There was good will among the parties to find a solution, and her delegation had supported the draft resolution in the hope that it would facilitate a settlement.

ABDUSSALAM SERGIWA (Libya) said he had voted against the draft resolution on the grounds that it did not help the problem. The issue should not be one of super-Power rivalry. The people of Afghanistan should be free to determine their own destiny without outside pressure, particularly from imperialist forces. Some of those who claimed to be defenders of Islam were in fact enemies of the Moslem cause.

The meeting adjourned at 12:52 p.m.

(END OF TAKE 12; ANNEX FOLLOWS)

ASSEMBLY PLENARY -- ANNEX

Vote on Draft Relating to Afghanistan

The General Assembly adopted the resolution calling for the withdrawal of foreign troops from Afghanistan by a recorded vote of 122 in favour to 20 against, with 11 abstentions, as follows:

In favour: Albania, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burma, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Cote d'Ivoire, Democratic Kampuchea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Fiji, France, Gabon, Gambia, Federal Republic of Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, St. Christopher and Nevis, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, United Republic of Tanzania, United States, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Afghanistan, Angola, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Byelorussia, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libya, Madagascar, Mongolia, Poland, Syria, Ukraine, USSR, Viet Nam.

Abstaining: Algeria, Benin, Cape Verde, Congo, Cyprus, Finland, India, Iraq, Mali, Nicaragua, Uganda.

Absent: Bhutan, Mozambique, Romania, Seychelles, Yemen.